

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner is thanked for the performance of a thorough search.

By this amendment, Claims 1, 4-6, 11, and 34-37 have been amended. No claims have been added or cancelled. Hence, Claims 1-37 are pending in the application.

OBJECTIONS FOR INFORMALITIES

Claims 4 and 36 were objected to for the use of commas instead of semi-colons to indicate separate lines within the claims. Claims 4 and 36 have been amended to use semi-colons instead of commas. Removal of the objection is requested.

Claims 4 and 6 were objected to for the use of parenthesis in the claims. Specifically, the Office Action objected to the use of the phrase "(IOT)." Claims 4 and 6 have been amended to omit parenthesis. Removal of the objection is requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

INDEPENDENT CLAIM 1

The Office Action rejected Claim 1 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,457,000 ("Witowski"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Witowski pertains to the implementation of a PRIOR function in an SQL query. As such, Witowski teaches retrieving data from and inserting data into database tables using SQL query statements, an operation during which temporary "buffer" tables may be created in memory or delivered to a client. However, Witowski does not disclose how data in the actual database tables are to be stored or accessed. For example, Witowski does not disclose how a database system, in response to receiving a SQL query that requires access to a row, actually accesses the required row in the database table.

In contrast, present Claim 1 recites:

1. A machine implemented method comprising:

accessing rows in a database table, wherein:

each row in the table corresponds to a dimension value combination;

each row in the table is stored in a block; and

a location within a block at which each row is stored is determined

based on the dimension value combination to which the row

corresponds; and

wherein the accessing of the rows also includes, in response to receiving a

request for a row corresponding to a particular dimension value

combination, using the particular dimension value combination for

calculating a value that represents the block that stores the particular

row.

Witkowski fails to disclose the accessing of rows *in a database table* wherein each row is *stored in a block* and wherein *a location within a block* at which each row is stored is determined based on the dimension value combination. Witkowski further fails to disclose using the particular dimension value combination for *calculating a value that represents the block that stores the particular row*.

Therefore, for at least the reasons mentioned above, Witkowski does not anticipate Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

DEPENDENT CLAIMS 2-33

The Office Action rejected Claims 2-33 as being anticipated by Witkowski. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 2-33 are dependent upon Claim 1, and thus include each and every feature of the corresponding independent claim. Each of Claims 2-33 is therefore allowable for the reasons given above for Claim 1. In addition, each of Claims 2-33 introduces one or more additional limitations that independently render it patentable. However, due to the fundamental differences already identified, to expedite the positive resolution of this case a separate discussion of those limitations is not included at this time. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 2-33 are allowable for the reasons given above with respect to Claim 1.

However, Applicant would like to comment on the Office Action's rejection of Claim 3. Claim 3 requires a "plurality of segments." Witkowski fails to teach a plurality of segments. Rather, the tables described in Witkowski each contain only one segment. Therefore Witkowski does not anticipate Claim 3.

INDEPENDENT CLAIM 34

The Office Action rejected Claim 34 as being anticipated by Witkowski. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Witkowski pertains to the implementation of a PRIOR function in an SQL query. As such, Witkowski teaches retrieving data from and inserting data into database tables using SQL query statements, an operation during which temporary "buffer" tables may be created in memory or delivered to a client. However, Witkowski does not disclose how data in the actual database tables are to be stored or accessed. For example, Witkowski does not disclose how a database system, in response to receiving a SQL query that requires inserting data into a table, actually stores the data in the database table.

In contrast, present Claim 34 recites:

34. A computer-readable medium, having stored therein at least:
a database table storing data on the computer readable media that corresponds
to locations associated with at least one dimension value;
wherein the data items are stored in blocks of the table in an order dictated by
the dimension values to which the data items correspond; and
wherein the table does not store values for the particular dimension.

Witkowski fails to disclose a database table *storing* data that corresponds to locations associated with at least one dimension value. Witkowski further fails to disclose data items *stored in blocks* of the table in an order dictated by the data dimension values.

Therefore, for at least the reasons mentioned above, Witkowski does not anticipate Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

DEPENDENT CLAIMS 35-37

The Office Action rejected Claims 35-37 as being anticipated by Witkowski. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 35-37 are dependent upon Claim 34, and thus include each and every feature of the corresponding independent claims. Each of Claims 35-37 is therefore allowable for the reasons given above for Claims 34. In addition, each of Claims 35-37 introduces one or more additional limitations that independently render it patentable. However, due to the fundamental differences already identified, to expedite the positive resolution of this case a separate discussion of those limitations is not included at this time. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 35-37 are allowable for the reasons given above with respect to Claims 34.

However, Applicant would like to comment on the Office Action's rejection of Claim 35. Claim 35 requires "all locations of the table that have non-null values" to be organized into segments. The Office Action suggests that this feature is met in Witkowski by the fact that Witkowski's PRIOR function returns a default value of 0 if it attempts to access a row outside of what is within the "addressable range of rows." In other words, a default value of 0 is returned if PRIOR attempts to access a row that does not exist within the table because it precedes the first row of data in that table. This returning of a default value of 0 fails to constitute a teaching of organizing *locations of the table that have non-null values*, since Witkowski says nothing about unique treatment of rows *in the table* based on whether they have null or non-null values. Therefore Witkowski does not anticipate Claim 35.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, the issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance is believed next in order, and that action is most earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages or credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP



Marcel K. Bingham
Reg. No. 42,327

Date: August 14, 2006

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, CA 95110-1089
(408) 414-1080
Facsimile: (408) 414-1076

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on 8/14/06 by Trudy Bagdon
Trudy Bagdon